

From: (b) (6)
To: "Cerise, Kathy" <Cerise.Kathryn@epa.gov>
CC: "Morrison, Kay" <morrison.kay@epa.gov>
Date: 11/8/2019 4:00:22 PM
Subject: Public Comment Quendall Terminals Superfund Site Cleanup Proposed Plans

Quendall Terminals Comments
Kathryn Cerise, 12-D12-1
U.S. EPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 155
Seattle, WA 98101

8 November 2019

Dear Ms. Cerise,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the US Environmental Protection Agency's Quendall Terminals Superfund Site Cleanup Proposed Plans.

As a long-time resident of the area, I appreciate efforts to remediate past industrial activities at this site, and would like to express support for OU1 Alternative 7a and OU2 Alternative D. Both have been identified as the Preferred Alternatives for future action.

My specific concern is of the costs related to the clean up, the 66.1M associated with Alternative 7a, and 39.9M under Alternative D.

How are theses costs to be allocated, and who is to benefit from a successful remediation of ill-informed past environmental practices? If – in the end – the public bears most of the burden while private development interests reap the benefit, the project is a failure. If – as the most cursory Internet search indicates – this results in a residential waterfront development opportunity for the affluent, while the public is burdened with the costs – the project fails. It is the Environmental Justice aspects of this proposal that I find most troubling; I have confidence in the Agency's technical acumen ultimately resulting in a successful remediation.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on this project.

Regards,

(b) (6)

Bellevue, WA 98007-6141

(b) (6)

E (b) (6)

T

Skype (b) (6)